

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 11, 13, 16-18, 21, 23, and 26-28 have been amended to more clearly describe Applicant's invention. No new matter has been added to the application.

Specification

The Examiner has identified a spelling error in the specification. Applicant has amended the paragraph beginning on page 1, line 20 to correct the error. Applicant requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9-17, 29 and 30

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 9-17, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,374,302 B1 (Galasso). The Examiner contends that Galasso discloses all of the limitations of the rejected claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The present invention is directed to communication between gatekeepers in a hybrid architecture. A hybrid architecture may include a combination of distributed and hierarchical architectures, for example. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11 and 21 to further emphasize how communications in hybrid architectures are accomplished. In particular, Applicant has amended these claims to include the limitation of "sending the requested information to a third gatekeeper wherein the first gatekeeper and the third gatekeeper are of a same hierarchical level and located in a same domain" (emphasis added). This added limitation further shows that communications occur between hierarchical levels of gatekeepers as well as distributed levels of gatekeepers located within a same domain.

Galasso discloses an action control point master gatekeeper for a communication network that creates a hierarchical infrastructure. All communications between gatekeepers must go through the master gatekeeper in a centralized manner. This is different from the present invention in which communications can be made between both hierarchical and distributed levels of gatekeepers. The present invention

also does not require a centralized gatekeeper to be included in all inter-gatekeeper communications. Galasso does not teach or disclose the ability to communicate between gatekeepers in both a distributed and hierarchical manner. Applicant submits that claims 1, 11 and 21, as amended, are not disclosed by Galasso. Claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12-17, 19, 20, 23-27, 29 and 30, being dependent upon independent claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, are also not taught or disclosed by Galasso. Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-17, 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) Rejection of Claims 8, 18 and 28

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 18 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Galasso in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,945 B1 (Sengodan). The Examiner correctly notes that Galasso does not disclose determining whether a hop-count field has been set to zero and if the hop-count field has been set to zero, dropping the received information. The Examiner contends that Sengodan teaches this limitation. The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Galasso to include a hop-count field as taught by Sengodan. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Sengodan discloses a method for providing resource discovery using multicast scope selection. Sengodan does not teach or disclose a method of communicating between gatekeepers in a hybrid architecture using distributed and hierarchical communications. More specifically, Sengodan does not teach the limitation of “sending the requested information to a third gatekeeper wherein the first gatekeeper and the third gatekeeper are of a same hierarchical level and located in a same domain” (emphasis added) as recited in amended claims 1, 11 and 21. Applicant submits that neither Galasso nor Sengodan, whether taken alone or in combination, teach or disclose Applicant’s invention as claimed. Claims 8, 18 and 28 being dependent upon independent claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, are also not taught or disclosed by the combination of Galasso and Sengodan. Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 8, 18 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/328,667
Amdt. dated May 2, 2003
Reply to Office Action of February 25, 2003

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and reconsideration is requested. If the Examiner believes that any issues remain unresolved, a telephone call to the undersigned would be welcome.

Respectfully,
Radhika R. Roy

By Michele L. Conover
Michele L. Conover
Reg. No. 34962
908-532-1879

AT&T Corp.
P.O. Box 4110
Middletown, New Jersey 07733
Date: May 2, 2003